

SECTION M: EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

SECTION M:	EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD	1
M.1	Clauses and Provisions Incorporated by Reference.....	1
M.2	Basis for Award.....	1
M.3	Down-select Decision	1
M.4	Order of Importance	1
M.5	Reserved.....	2
M.6	Completed PRS Section	2
M.7	Evaluation Process.....	2
	M.7.1 Best Value Process	2
	M.7.2 Volume I Evaluation.....	2
	M.7.3 Volume II Evaluation Process	3
	M.7.4 Volumes III and IV Evaluation Process.....	3
M.8	Ratings	4
M.9	Evaluation Criteria.....	4
	M.9.1 Volume I: Technical.....	4
	M.9.2 Volume II: Cost.....	4
	M.9.3 Volume III: Subcontracting Plan	5
	M.9.4 Volume IV: Quality Management Plan	5
	M.9.5 Volume V: Benefit Assessment.....	5

SECTION M: EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

M.1 Clauses and Provisions Incorporated by Reference

This Screening Information Request (SIR) or contract, as applicable, incorporates by reference one or more provisions or clauses listed below with the same force and effect as if they were given in full text. Upon request, the Contracting Officer (CO) will make the full text available or potential SPs (SPs) may obtain the full text via Internet at <http://fast.faa.gov> (on this web page, select “toolsets,” and the “procurement toolbox”).

M.2 Basis for Award

The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) plans to follow the intent of Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-76 governing public-private competition and will conduct the acquisition in accordance with the FAA Acquisition Management System (AMS). Award will be made to the SP whose proposal is judged to represent the Best Value to the Government. The Government will use the results of the technical and a cost evaluation to determine which offer represents Best Value. The Source Selection Authority (SSA) will consider the final evaluation and use his/her best judgment to arrive at a Best Value decision. Therefore, the successful SP may not have necessarily submitted the lowest price.

To be eligible for award, the SP must be financially responsible and have acceptable Subcontracting and Quality Management Plans.

Unrealistically low or high proposed prices may be grounds for eliminating a proposal from competition either on the basis that the SP does not understand the requirements or has developed an impracticable proposal. Proposals shall be sufficiently detailed to demonstrate their ability to meet the requirements of this SIR. The burden of proof for credibility rests with the SP. Lack of cost realism will result in the proposal being eliminated from further consideration.

While the Government Source Selection Evaluation Board (SSEB) and the SSA will strive for maximum objectivity, the source selection process, by nature is subjective and professional judgment is implicit throughout the entire process. The Government intends to select one SP to provide Automated Flight Service Station (AFSS) services.

M.3 Down-select Decision

The Government reserves the right to make down-select decisions prior to a final award decision. These decisions will be made after receipt and evaluation of responses to the requirements of this SIR. Each down-select decision will be based upon identification of those SPs deemed to be least likely to receive the award.

If at any point during the evaluation process, the Government concludes that a SP does not have a reasonable chance of receiving this award, the Government may eliminate them from further consideration for award. Any SP eliminated from further consideration will be officially notified in writing.

M.4 Order of Importance

The following are the Proposal Volumes for this solicitation with their associated factors:

Volume Number	Volume Title	Criteria
I	Technical	Phase In Performance Management Service Delivery Approach
II	Cost	Total Cost of Ownership
III	Subcontracting Plan	
IV	Quality Management Plan	
V	Benefit Assessment	N/A

Volume I is more important than Volume II. Volume III and Volume IV will be evaluated as pass/fail. Volume V will not be separately evaluated but the contents will be used to assist in the Best Value decision. All criteria for Volume I are of equal weight. The relative weight of the factors within in each criterion is **TBD**.

The factors for Volume II are **TBD**.

M.5 Reserved

M.6 Completed PRS Section

The completed Performance Work Statement (PWS) Performance Requirements Summary (PRS) will not be evaluated separately but the merits of the filled-in values and additional parameters will be incorporated in the evaluation of the criteria delineated in Volume I.

M.7 Evaluation Process

M.7.1 Best Value Process

The SSEB will assess Best Value by taking the evaluation results for all the volumes and comparing the merits of the SP offerings. The order of importance delineated in Section M.4 will be used when assessing the importance of the evaluation results. As the results of the more important items become equivalent, the lesser important items become more important. For example, as the results for Volume I become equivalent, the results of Volume II will have more weight in the Best Value analysis.

M.7.2 Volume I Evaluation

M.7.2.1 Volume I Evaluation Process

The SP will be evaluated based on a written proposal, oral presentations and written discussions if issued. Each criterion listed in Section M.9.1 will be evaluated based on the SP's approach, capability and experience relating to the requirements in this SIR.

The Government will identify benefits and risk for each factor of each criterion. Based on the benefits and risk, the evaluation team will assign a rating. When evaluating the factors, consideration will be given for the SP's ability to identify and mitigate risk. For a SP to state simply that an approach is low risk or has no risk will not necessarily be rated higher than a response that identifies and mitigates the risk with a plan. SPs are encouraged to identify any and all risks and benefits. Stating that there is little or no

risk may lead the Government to believe the SP does not have an adequate understanding of the challenge at hand, and may be grounds for elimination from the competition.

The Government will use the results of the factor-based evaluations to determine the rating for each criterion. The criterion evaluation results will be used to determine the overall proposal rating. Ratings will be based on the rating scheme described in Section M.8.

The data obtained from oral presentations, if issued, will be used as additional data to clarify, substantiate and validate the information provided in Volume I. Although not rated separately, the data obtained from the oral presentations are integral to the overall evaluation of the criteria in Volume I.

For reference, a redacted version of the draft AFSS Competitive Sourcing Study SIR Evaluation Plan is provided as Attachment **TBD**. The SSEB membership will not be released.

SPs are reminded that the information included in their proposals, oral presentations and formal discussions will be the basis for the evaluation, and SPs should consider the evaluation factors in this section very carefully when preparing their responses. The Government reserves the right to contact customers or other sources of information not specifically referenced in the proposal. The Government will exercise judgment and maximum discretion in evaluating all information collected.

M.7.2.2 Volume I Evaluation Definitions

The following are the definitions for terms to be used by the Government in evaluating Volume I proposals.

Approach - A way or means of fulfilling the AFSS requirements; a logical method used to accomplish the requirements

Capability - Ability to execute the AFSS requirements

Experience - Active participation in activities leading to the accumulation of knowledge or skill

Benefit – A positive aspect of the SP's offering

Risk - Potential for a negative outcome

M.7.3 Volume II Evaluation Process

The proposal will first be reviewed to determine whether it follows the requirements of Section L and includes all of the data and other required information. Omission of significant data or information may be considered grounds for eliminating the proposal from further consideration.

The proposed price shall be evaluated to determine if that price is realistic for the work to be performed, reflects a clear understanding of the requirements, and is consistent with the unique methods of performance and materials described in the SP's technical proposal. Based on the SP's submission of the Cost Model, the proposal will be evaluated for cost reasonableness at the WBS level. Lack of cost realism will result in the proposal being eliminated from further consideration.

M.7.4 Volumes III and IV Evaluation Process

To be determined. This section will describe the process for acceptable/not acceptable .

M.8 Ratings

The following defines the rating scheme for the Volume I Technical Proposal

Table M.8 – Color Rating

Color	Rating	Definition
Blue	Exceptional	To be determined.
Green	Acceptable	To be determine d.
Yellow	Marginal	To be determined.
Red	Unacceptable	To be determined.

M.9 Evaluation Criteria

M.9.1 Volume I: Technical

M.9.1.1 Technical Evaluation Criteria

The following is an outline of the criteria to be used in the technical evaluation. The complete description of the criteria can be found in Attachment M-1.

Criterion 1: Phase In

- Factor 1: Phase In Methodology
- Factor 2: Human Capital Management
- Factor 3: Program Management

Criterion 2: Performance Management

- Factor 1: Performance Management Methodology
- Factor 2: Continuous Improvement

Criterion 3: Service Delivery

- Factor 1: End State Service Delivery Method
- Factor 2: Transition

M.9.2 Volume II: Cost

M.9.2.1 Total Ownership Cost

Total Ownership Cost (TOC) will be evaluated in constant FY04 dollars, discounted by the Government to FY04. The discount rate applied will be in accordance with the Real Interest Rates on Treasury Notes

and Bonds published in the version of Appendix C of OMB Circular No. A-94 in effect on the date this SIR is issued. For proposal evaluation purposes, TOC is defined as comprising the following:

- M.9.2.1.1 The total of the Contract Line Item Number (CLIN) amounts in FY04 dollars. This will be the sum of all fixed-price-incentive fee CLIN ceiling prices and time-and-materials ceiling prices, and it will include the base period plus all award term periods.
- M.9.2.1.2 Government-inherent costs that are chargeable to appropriations associated with AFSS's but are outside the scope of this solicitation. For example, the SP will not be responsible for decommissioning facilities that are no longer needed; however, decommissioning costs are a real cost to the Government and will be taken into account during the evaluation. The solicitation will provide Government-inherent unit costs so that the SP may calculate the cost impacts of its cost proposal.
- M.9.2.1.3 Cost for use of optional Government Furnished Equipment (GFE) will be assessed based on the SP's listing of which GFE they intend to use. Cost for optional GFE can be found in Technical Exhibit E-1. Although the use and maintenance of the optional GFE will be offered free of charge for two years after Phase-In, a cost for use will be assessed for evaluation purposes.

TOC elements described in M.9.2.1.1 and M.9.2.1.3 will be used to assess whether the projected funding profile delineated in Section H.29 is met or exceeded. All TOC elements fit within the ceiling profile delineated in Section B.6.

For reference see Technical Appendix J-8 for FY2002 AFSS Cost of Operation

M.9.3 Volume III: Subcontracting Plan

To be determined.

M.9.4 Volume IV: Quality Management Plan

The SP provides a detailed quality management plan that identifies the processes to be used during the performance of the contract that will ensure acceptable performance. This plan meets the requirements for a quality management plan identified in the PWS.

The SP details a logical process for early identification of non-conforming services or equipment and their root cause(s), metrics for tracking performance trends, methods for problem avoidance, details of corrective actions required to ensure timely and acceptable delivery and performance in accordance the PWS and demonstrates alignment with the Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan (QASP).

M.9.5 Volume V: Benefit Assessment

The contents of the Benefit Assessment will not be evaluated separately. They will be used as additional data to support a Best Value decision.

ATTACHMENT M-1 TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

Criterion 1: Phase In	Approach Benefit/Risk	Capability Benefit/Risk	Experience Benefit/Risk
Factor: Phase In Methodology	<p>The degree to which the approach for Phase In methodology is sound¹</p> <p>The degree to which the approach meets or exceeds the requirements for providing all services within the schedule constraints stipulated in Section F²</p> <p>The degree to which the approach for Phase In ensures continuity of service for the services defined in Section C³</p>	<p>The degree to which the SP has the necessary capability to execute the Phase In methodology</p> <p>The degree to which the SP has the capability to meet or exceed the requirements of providing all services within the schedule constraints stipulated in Section F</p> <p>The degree to which the SP has the capability to ensure continuity of service for the services defined in Section C</p>	<p>The degree to which the SP has the experience that would enable them to adequately execute the phase in methodology</p> <p>The degree to which the SP has the experience to meet or exceed the requirements of providing all services within the schedule constraints stipulated in Section F</p> <p>The degree to which the SP has the experience to ensure continuity of service for the services defined in Section C</p>

¹ Is the approach viable for "take over" of all AFSS services at the end of the phase in period?
Does the approach address all labor, material, equipment, and facilities required?
Is the approach well thought out and thorough enough to ensure a smooth "cut over" of services?

² Does the phase in schedule contain enough detail to ensure adequate understanding and preparation for the effort?

³ Is the phase in approach sound enough to ensure continuity of service through the "cut over" to transition?

Criterion 1: Phase In/Mobilization	Approach Benefit/Risk	Capability Benefit/Risk	Experience Benefit/Risk
Factor: Human Capital Management	<p>The degree to which the approach secures personnel (e.g., recruiting, hiring, and schedule)¹</p> <p>The degree to which the approach is aligned with the schedule.</p> <p>The degree to which the approach enables personnel retention.</p> <p>The degree to which the approach for training and employee certification is sound.²</p>	<p>The degree to which the SP has the capability to secure personnel (e.g., recruiting, hiring, and schedule)¹</p> <p>The degree to which the SP has the capability to align the transition schedule with the human capital management approach.</p> <p>The degree to which the SP has the capability to execute the personnel retention approach.</p> <p>The degree to which the SP has the capability to execute the training and employee certification approach.</p>	<p>The degree to which the SP has the experience to secure personnel (e.g., recruiting, hiring, and schedule)³</p> <p>The degree to which the SP has the experience to align with the transition schedule with the human capital management approach.</p> <p>The degree to which the SP has the experience to execute the personnel retention approach.</p> <p>The degree to which SP has the experience for training and employee certification.</p>

¹ Recruiting/Staffing

- Does the recruiting plan address all unique aspects of the A-76 environment?

² Training and Employee Certification

- Does the training and certification approach address attrition and refresher training?
- Does the training and certification approach address initial and follow up re-certification actions?
- Is the methodology for establishing employee competency sufficient?

³ Recruiting/Staffing

- Does the experience include recruiting and staffing on a scale similar to AFSS (e.g., at least 1500 employees, specialized and uniquely skilled workforce)?

Criterion 1: Phase In	Approach Benefit/Risk	Capability Benefit/Risk	Experience Benefit/Risk
Factor: Program Management	<p>The degree to which the approach for management of the AFSS service delivery is sound¹</p> <p>The degree to which the approach for organization design enables management of nationwide delivery of service with adequate management controls.²</p> <p>The degree to which the approach communication within and outside the potential SP's organization is effective³</p>	<p>The degree to which the SP has the capability to manage the AFSS service delivery</p> <p>The degree to which the SP has the capability to implement the organizational design.</p> <p>The degree to which the SP has the capability to execute effective lines of communication within and outside the potential SP's organization.</p>	<p>The degree to which the SP has the experience to manage the AFSS service delivery</p> <p>The degree to which the SP has the experience to implement the organizational design.</p> <p>The degree to which the SP has experience with communication within and outside the SP's organization.²</p>

¹ Are the management methods and processes proposed adequate to execute the contract?

Is the team proposed appropriate for the approach proposed (e.g., are the right companies doing the right things?)

² Is the organizational design appropriate to effectively execute the contract considering the geographically dispersed delivery of services?

Do the management controls align with the organizational design?

³ Are the lines of communication within and outside the organization adequately addressed?

Does the organizational design allow for effective communication?

Criterion 2: Performance Management	Approach Benefit/Risk	Capability Benefit/Risk	Experience Benefit/Risk
Factor: Performance Management Methodology	<p>The degree to which the approach for performance management as detailed in the Quality Management Plan is sound¹</p> <p>The degree to which the approach aligns with the performance based contract environment²</p>	<p>The degree to which the SP has the capability to execute the Performance Management approach</p> <p>The degree to which the SP has the capability to align the performance management approach with the performance based contract environment</p>	<p>The degree to which the SP has experience executing a Performance Management approach</p> <p>The degree to which the SP has experience aligning a performance management approach with the performance based contract environment</p>

¹ Does the approach demonstrate the understanding of the complexities involved in performance management of the AFSS services?

² The performance based contract environment includes things such as performance improvement schedule and service level agreement?

Criterion 2: Performance Management	Approach Benefit/Risk	Capability Benefit/Risk	Experience Benefit/Risk
Factor: Continuous Improvement	<p>The degree to which the approach ensures continuous performance improvement.</p> <p>The degree to which the approach aligns the continuing performance improvement method with the service delivery approach.</p>	<p>The degree to which the SP has the capability to implement the approach for continuing performance improvement.</p> <p>The degree to the SP has the capability to align the continuing performance improvement method with the service delivery approach.</p>	<p>The degree to the SP has experience implementing the approach for continuing performance improvement.</p> <p>The degree to which the SP has the experience to align the continuing performance improvement method with the service delivery approach.</p>

Criterion 3: Service Delivery	Approach Benefit/Risk	Capability Benefit/Risk	Experience Benefit/Risk
Factor: End State Service Delivery Method	<p>The degree to which the approach for the end state service delivery method (i.e., including systems and processes) meets or exceeds the requirements in Section C.^{1,2}</p> <p>The degree to which the approach meets or exceeds the performance specifications proposed in completed PWS PRS table discussed in Section L.19.1³</p>	<p>The degree to which the SP has the capability to implement the approach for the end state service delivery method</p> <p>The degree to which the SP has the capability to implement the approach to meet or exceed the performance specifications proposed in the complete PWS PRS table.</p>	<p>The degree to which the SP has experience implementing the approach for the end state service delivery method</p> <p>The degree to which the SP has experience implementing the approach to meet or exceed the performance specifications proposed in the complete PWS PRS table.</p>

¹ Is the concept of operations is well defined and comprehensive?
Is the service delivery method appropriate for the staffing approach proposed?
Are the requirements within each service category adequately addressed through out life of contract?
Is the physical and logical integration of SP system to NAS feasible and sound?
Does the service delivery method ensure continuity of service (i.e., 24/7/365 operations) from phase in through end state?
Does the service delivery method address the program goals of improved performance and efficiency?

³ Is the service delivery method appropriate for the values of the performance standards proposed?

Criterion 3: Service Delivery	Approach Benefit/Risk	Capability Benefit/Risk	Experience Benefit/Risk
Factor: Transition	<p>The degree to which the approach for the transition schedule to meets the requirements in Section F¹</p> <p>The degree to which the approach for transition is sound²</p>	<p>The degree to which the SP has the capability to implement the transition schedule</p> <p>The degree to which the SP has the capability to implement the transition approach</p>	<p>The degree to which the SP has the necessary experience to implement the transition schedule</p> <p>The degree to which the SP has the necessary experience to implement the transition approach</p>

¹ Is the Transition schedule well aligned with proposed service delivery approach, cost improvement schedule, and performance improvement schedules?

Is the schedule appropriate for the staffing levels and technical complexity proposed?

² Does the transition approach address all aspects required for a smooth transition from phase in through the end-state configuration?

Is the transition approach technically viable from phase in through end state configuration?

Are the staffing levels appropriate for the transition approach and the technical complexity proposed?